



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/575,984	05/23/2000	Alan Lin	5244-0127-2	3072

22850 7590 06/10/2005

OBLON, SPIVAK, MCCLELLAND, MAIER & NEUSTADT, P.C.  
1940 DUKE STREET  
ALEXANDRIA, VA 22314

EXAMINER
----------

BRINICH, STEPHEN M

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2624

DATE MAILED: 06/10/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.



**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE**

**U.S. Patent and Trademark Office**

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

APPLICATION NO./ CONTROL NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR / PATENT IN REEXAMINATION	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
---------------------------------	-------------	---	---------------------

EXAMINER
----------

ART UNIT	PAPER
----------	-------

20050518

DATE MAILED:

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner for Patents

## Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/575,984

**Applicant(s)**

LIN, ALAN

**Examiner**

Stephen M. Brinich

**Art Unit**

2624

**– The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address –**  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 3/16/05.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-33 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                        | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)                     |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)    | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____  |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                    |

Art Unit: 2624

**DETAILED ACTION**

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.
2. Claims 1-33 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kuroyanagi in view of Applicant's admitted Prior Art.

Re claims 1-33, Kuroyanagi discloses (column 5, line 46 - column 6, line 33) a print job managing arrangement in which print jobs are transmitted to a printer (500) from a print server computer (100) with print job information stored in a storage device separate from the printer (103). Kuroyanagi further discloses (column 3, lines 26-48 & 60-66) inputting of print job information (103a) including a user password (identification information) via a personal computer (300) and comparing this identification information to print job identification information stored in the storage device (103) (column 4, lines 13-35).

Further re claims 1, 4-9, 12-17, 19-24, & 31-33, part of the print job information (103a) input at the personal computer (300) (i.e. printing count 604) is uploaded to the print server computer (100) (inherently editing the information previously stored there, either by adding new information or replacing

Art Unit: 2624

older information, so that the information received by the printer is the edited version).

Further re claims 27-30, the storage device 103 is provided in print server 100.

Further re claims 1, 9, 17, & 24-26, Kuroyanagi does not disclose the prompting of a computer user to enter information in response to a graphical user interface display or through the use of a push button.

The prompting of a computer user to enter information (such as a password) is well known in the art as described by Applicant (page 2, line 29 - page 3, line 1). The use of a password prompt in Kuroyanagi in order to insure that the user is made aware of the need to enter the user password would be an expedient obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

The use of a push button to enter commands to a personal computer is readable upon the use of a standard keyboard (containing a plurality of push buttons such as the "ENTER" key) or a standard mouse (containing at least one push button). The use of a standard keyboard or mouse as a user input device for the PC (300) described by Kuroyanagi in order to allow a user to employ a standard user interface would be an expedient obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art.

Art Unit: 2624

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments filed 3/16/05 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Re claims 1, 9, 17, Applicant argues (3/16/05 Response: page 9, line 16 - page 11, line 5) that Kuroyanagi does not teach or suggest editing print job information at a printer using a computer that is separate from a printer and that prompts a user to enter identification information.

However, the phrase "edit[ing] said print job information at said printer" (claim 1, line 8; claim 9, line 9; claim 17, lines 13-14) is readable upon either an editing operation performed at said printer on the job information or an editing operation performed upon job information that is placed (at some point) at said printer. As noted above, the latter interpretation is readable upon Kuroyanagi.

Re claims 2-3, 10-11, 18, & 27-29, Applicant argues (3/16/05 Response: page 11, lines 6-17) that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as their parent claims 1, 9, & 17 and because they recite further features of the inventions that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

The argument re claims 1, 9, & 17 has been addressed above. The argument that these claims recite further features of the inventions that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the

Art Unit: 2624

references of record is not supported by the pointing out of specific features accompanied by explanations of how these features differ from the references of record.

Re claim 24, Applicant argues (3/16/05 Response: page 11, line 18 - page 12, line 13) that Kuroyanagi does not teach or suggest editing the printing information using the computer from which print jobs originate.

In the Kuroyanagi arrangement, as noted above, the sending of a print job from the personal computer (300) causing new print job information to replace the previous print job information at the print server computer (100). Thus, this editing operation reads on the recitation that it is "using said computer," as the personal computer (300) is used in the operation.

Re claims 25-26 & 30-33, Applicant argues (3/16/05 Response: page 12, lines 14-22) that these claims are allowable for the same reasons as their parent claims 1, 9, 17, & 22 and because they recite further features of the inventions that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record.

The arguments re claims 1, 9, 17, & 22 have been addressed above. The argument that these claims recite further features of the inventions that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the references of record is not supported by the pointing out of

Art Unit: 2624

specific features accompanied by explanations of how these features differ from the references of record.

**Conclusion**

4. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Stephen M. Brinich at 571-272-7430. The examiner can normally be reached on weekdays 7:00-4:30, alternate Fridays off.




Art Unit: 2624

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 Customer Service center at 571-272-2600 or to the USPTO Contact Center at 800-786-9199 or 703-308-4357.

If attempts to contact the examiner and the Customer Service Center are unsuccessful, supervisor David Moore can be contacted at 571-272-7437.

Faxes pertaining to this application should be directed to the Tech Center 2600 official fax number, which is 703-872-9306.

Stephen M Brinich  
Examiner  
Art Unit 2624

smb   
May 19, 2005



THOMAS D  
~~POWER~~ LEE  
PRIMARY EXAMINER